

Date: Thu, 28 Jan 93 04:30:20 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #24
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 28 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 24

Today's Topics:

Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)
My call sign : (Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?
Rec.radio.info now available by mail

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 27 Jan 93 12:51:11 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!darwin.sura.net!
newsserver.jvnc.net!netnews.upenn.edu!prijat!triangle.cs.uofs.edu!
bill@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <8557@lib.tmc.edu>, jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
|>
|> Herein lies the fundamental disagreement: I believe that this forum has
|> different standards of propriety from the ones you're used to. By the
|> standards I use, and which I believe are in common use on the net, the
|> occasional profanity is not only tolerated but appropriate. I only use it when
|> I feel it necessary to convey extreme emotion; in the absence of other clues,
|> such as voice inflections, this is sometimes necessary.

Tell me something Jay, if you were invited to speak before a group of people
at your local high school on amateur radio, would you punctuate your talk with
profanity the way you think it should be here??

USENET/INTERNET is changing just like Ham Radio. There are a lot of schools below the University level receiving this group now. Of course, this has always been "mixed company".

I don't think I would be classed as a prude, but then, I also don't think of USENET as being the same as a Marine barracks either.

bill KB3YV

--

Bill Gunshannon | "There are no evil thoughts, Mr. Reardon" Francisco
bill@cs.uofs.edu | said softly, "except one; the refusal to think."
| #include <std.disclaimer.h>

Date: 27 Jan 93 09:07:17 -0500
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!yale.edu!
newsserver.jvnc.net!darwin.sura.net!guvax.acc.georgetown.edu!
roakley@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: My call sign : (

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>
>>Hi all,
>
>>I passed my element 2 and 3A on Dec 3, 1993. The problem is that I still
>>dont have a call sign.
>
>
> Yes, it's taking about 12 weeks these days, at least thats how
> long it took my two friends to get their calls, so dont be worried.
>

Based on the date you took the exam, your probably have a fairly long wait yet, at least until sometime in 94...

73, (You'll probably get it in mid-February)

Bob
WK3C

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 93 18:15:31 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!moe.ksu.ksu.edu!
hobbes.physics.uiowa.edu!news.iastate.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!swrinde!
gatech!paladin.american.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!
orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus
Subject: Pres. Clinton speech via Packet?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <14600040@hpnmldla.sr.hp.com> alanb@hpnmldla.sr.hp.com (Alan Bloom) writes:

>In rec.radio.amateur.policy, steve@zero.com (Steve Urich) writes:

>

>> Just wondering what the legal implications are if one would resent
>> Pres. Clintons enaugural speech via packet? I read the speech and
>> it looks pretty harmless, more like poetry :-).

>

>If it is sent in a 2-way QSO with another station, no problem. If it is
>broadcast via a packet BBS bulletin, then it violates the restrictions
>on broadcasting:

>

> 97.113 (c) No station shall transmit communications in order to
> engage in any form of broadcasting...

>

> 97.3 (10) Broadcasting. Transmissions intended for reception
> by the general public, either direct or relayed. ...

> (23) Informational bulletin. A message directed only to amateur
> operators consisting solely of subject matter of direct interest
> to the amateur service.

>

> 97.111 (b) In addition to one-way transmissions specifically
> authorized elsewhere in this Part, an amateur station may transmit
> the following types of one-way communications: ...

> (6) Transmissions necessary to disseminate information bulletins.

>

>In other words, you can send bulletins of interest to the amateur service
>as such, but not bulletins of interest to the general public.

I believe the notion of "broadcasting" here means that you intend for non-amateurs (i.e. "general public") to be the receiving audience. I do not believe that Part 97 would prohibit the sending of a packet bulletin containing Clinton's speech to a wide distribution on packet radio, since only amateurs can practically receive packet bulletins (AX.25 is a two-way, non-broadcast, protocol).

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer

*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Tue, 26 Jan 1993 12:12:24 MST
From: agate!spool.mu.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
destroyer!cs.ubc.ca!unixg.ubc.ca!kakwa.ucs.ualberta.ca!ersys!adec23!ve6mgs!rec-
radio-info@ames.arpa
Subject: Rec.radio.info now available by mail
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

If you would like to subscribe to a mailing list to receive the periodic information bulletins posted to the new newsgroup REC.RADIO.INFO, send a mail with a line

```
sub radio-info  
to      listserv@ucsd.edu
```

Please note that if you are on bitnet, one of the dozens of broken milnet hosts or a non-Unix host, or otherwise don't have a valid return address in your From: header line, you'd be better off specifying your address explicitly in the subscription request:

```
sub mymailbox@myhost.mydomain.mil radio-info  
or  
sub MEMEME01@DMBHST.bitnet radio-info  
or something like that.
```

Please note that this is NOT a daily digest; the messages are too big to make it worthwhile. The moderated postings to the newsgroup will simply be mailed to you at a low priority throughout the day as they arrive at UCSD.

I do not plan to archive the postings to this group; we don't have the disk space for it.

Share and enjoy.

- Brian

--
- Postings to rec.radio.info: rec-radio-info@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca
- rec.radio.info administrivia: rec-radio-request@ve6mgs.ampr.ab.ca

Date: 27 Jan 1993 14:43:06 GMT

From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!spool.mu.edu!sdd.hp.com!cs.utexas.edu!
bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C1HA8w.GHx@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, <8559@lib.tmc.edu>, <C1HLvo.5Js@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>utex
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <C1HLvo.5Js@hpuerca.atl.hp.com> jab@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Alan Barrow) writes:

>I disagree with the implication (maybe misread from you, but stated by >others in this argument) that no one used 440 until recently except the closed >rptr crowd. The "what is this 2nd band on my new HT... Gee these guys don't >like me!" argument for closed repeaters. (Repeatedly quoted by a certain >Usenet/ham in San Diego.)

440 didn't see much activity at all, at least here, until the proliferation of dual-band radios. Once upon a time not long after they were introduced, I bought one each of the IC2/3/4AT series, and got far more use out of the 2 and 220 radios than the one on 440. 440 was the province of a few diehards who wanted to get away from the crowds on 2; 220 was populated in the Houston area mainly by a bunch of folks who got together and bought Clegg FM76s in group purchases because they thought 220 was a neat idea. (The first 220 repeater in the Houston area went on originally under my repeater callsign, WR5ATG.) (I still have my old call letter license plates with that call, too.)

>Both locally and in surrounding states, the majority of 440 repeaters >were pioneers, but remained open. (I *know* about Fla and Ga.)
>Note that PL does not automatically mean closed.

I understand that, though others may not. There were only a few open 440 repeaters here in the Houston area when I first got on the band. It is my understanding that 440 started out mainly with closed repeaters in California and Texas; that was due to the owners being told that that was where closed repeaters should go.

>My first 440 operations were in the 70's (when I was licensed) on 444.5 >here in Atlanta. I have been on 440 pretty much since then, and is my >band of choice.

It is my band of choice as well, although it is losing a lot of its charm as dual-band radios become more prevalent and the lids I got off of 2 meters to get away from buy them. (Flame retardant: I'm not saying that all 2 meter operators are lids by any means.)

>The way the large group mentioned earlier avoids congestion is by >promoting new bands, having local qso rptrs, using simplex when >appropriate, etc. (One "feature" could only be obtained by getting

>active on 220, to help promote band usage, and prevent crowding)

How many repeaters does that group have? How much overlapping coverage can they count on to let them have different repeaters for different purposes? How did they get that many frequency pairs?

You're describing a completely different situation than the one we have here: we don't want to hassle with running a large club/group/whatever. That merely introduces politics and headaches.

>I still think trunking technology could be modified, and useful to hams.
>I will take many players to make a go of it, but until we have a
>technical revolution (spread spectrum?), we may have to get smarter in
>our designs.

I agree that trunking technology would be neat, but to be effective, you're talking about an order of magnitude more resources than the current system. That gets either into large groups (see above) or getting many smaller groups to work together, when the smaller groups happened in a lot of cases because they didn't like the folks in the other groups.

>Again, is a full duplex NBFM repeater (regardless of links, remote bases, etc)
>that much to be proud of? In the days of DSP's, AMSAT, cheap CODEC's, etc, I
>think we can do better.

I do, too; I think that spread spectrum has real possibilities. Even so, you still need a place to talk until the whiz-bang technology reaches production status. As for AMSAT, there's a significant body of opinion that it's not ready for prime time communications until you can point the antenna, bolt it in place, and get 24-hour communications.

--
Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can
jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"I don't want to read poor Microsoft bashing. I want to read good
Microsoft bashing." -- Douglas A. Bell, in comp.os.os2.advocacy (Me too!)

Date: Wed, 27 Jan 1993 21:47:42 GMT
From: yuma!gw214790@purdue.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8565@lib.tmc.edu>, <Jan27.175006.47745@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>,
<8573@lib.tmc.edu>.edu
Subject : Re: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

In article <8573@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>In article <Jan27.175006.47745@yuma.ACNS.ColoState.EDU>

gw214790@LANCE.ColoState.Edu (Galen Watts) writes:
>>In article <8565@lib.tmc.edu> jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:
>>I don't think that this is a Marine barracks either, but, as I told Jon Bloom,
>>there are times that other words don't fit.
>>Try "60 days to a more effective vocabulary". There are words that do fit
>>that are not offensive to anyone.
>
>Sorry. I can only disagree.
>If you are that easily offended, how do you function in society?

The ease at which I'm offended depends on the individual situation.
I am not as easily offended as the minister down the street, but obviously
I am more easily offended than you. When offended, I sometimes go
for long walks near my rural home, or just laugh at the limited
vocabulary of those that offend me.

>
>>Some of us aren't prudes and don't swear when we injure ourselves.
>
>I can only admire your forbearance. Would that it were not associated with
>blatant prudery and offensensitivity.

My forbearance comes from long experience in how not to injure myself
when performing menial tasks. If my prudery is blatant, then your
capacity to offend must be infinite.

This is fun,
Galen Watts, KF0YJ and president of the Bug Jay Maynard Society.

Date: 27 Jan 1993 15:22:57 GMT
From: sun-barr!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!lib!oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu!jmaynard@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1047@arrl.org>, <8557@lib.tmc.edu>, <11545@prijat.cs.uofs.edu>
Subject : Re: Language on the net (was Re: Closed repeaters)

In article <11545@prijat.cs.uofs.edu> bill@cs.uofs.edu (Bill Gunshannon) writes:
>Tell me something Jay, if you were invited to speak before a group fo people
>at your local high school on amateur radio, would you punctuate your talk with
>profanity the way you think it should be here??

No, for many reasons. First of all, I doubt seriously that I would encounter
the need to denounce a jammer or comment on other similar situations. Second,
the forum is different, both because it would be an invited talk, not an
ongoing discussion, and because it would be possible to use other means of
conveying emotion. Third, I don't "punctuate" my messages with such language;
the one that started all of this was the first time in several months that I

had felt it necessary to employ such strong terms. Finally, while I do not believe the kids would object, I'm certain that the teacher or other official who did the inviting would, and that would make it much less likely that I would be invited back.

>USENET/INTERNET is changing just like Ham Radio. There are a lot of schools >below the University level receiving this group now. Of course, this has >always been "mixed company".

That kind of language is far from the worst that kids hear regularly; one adjective in an extrelemy strong statement of disgust is hardly going to send a kid down the road to ruin.

I'll ask you the same question as I've asked before: how do you react when you drop a desk on your foot? Are those words not in your vocabulary at all?

>I don't think I would be classed as a prude, but then, I also don't think of >USENET as being the same as a Marine barracks either.

I don't think that this is a Marine barracks either, but, as I told Jon Bloom, there are times that other words don't fit.

--

Jay Maynard, EMT-P, K5ZC, PP-ASEL | Never ascribe to malice that which can jmaynard@oac.hsc.uth.tmc.edu | adequately be explained by stupidity.

"begin 666 foo 266]U(&AA=F4@;F\@;&EF92X: ` end" -- Daniel Drucker

Date: 27 Jan 1993 20:28:33 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!cs.tamu.edu!kurt@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C19xn1.EAJ@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, <1k1hukINNb7m@tamsun.tamu.edu>, <C1HA8w.GHx@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

In article <C1HA8w.GHx@hpuerca.atl.hp.com>, jab@hpuerca.atl.hp.com (Alan Barrow) writes:

|> get a life, Kurt... This is a comment regarding the technical argument
|> that linking requires closed repeaters. I have seen multiple examples of
|> open linked systems that equal or surpass the Cactus system in
|> capability.

I, too, have seen multiple examples of open linked systems that equal/surpass Cactus. I have seen multiple examples of closed linked systems that equal/surpass Cactus. However, I do not insult their efforts by calling them "lacking". THAT is what I call "technical snobbery". Each system has its own philosophy and technical merits. I am not one to pass judgement on their

efforts to the world. I may have my own views, but IT WORKS FOR THEM AND THEY ARE APPARENTLY HAPPY.

|> Using the "fragile technology" excuse for closed repeaters will never
|> wash. There are too many working examples.

The "fragile technology" point was jumped upon and given far too much bandwidth.

|> >|> You turn on your lid filter, and he goes away. See above postings.
|> >|> Closed repeaters draw these guys like magnets. This is not a problem
|>
|> >So do discussions on closed/open repeaters, it would seem.
|>
|> You cannot address the real issue, so now you call anyone with a
|> difference of opinion a Lid. No wonder closed repeaters have problems.

I fail to see the relevance. I did not use the term lid. I was making a comment (that apparently missed some; not surprising) about the quality of argument on said discussions. Quote the whole reference, with appropriate "credits", next time. I do not call anyone with a difference of opinion a lid. Depending on the validity of the D00, I may consider him a fool, however.

|>
|> Sorry Kurt, you must not have read the original post. Jay "The ignorant sput" Maynard implied (as has others) that closed repeaters are the only ones doing work in other bands. If you had really read my post you would see that I described these guys as not technically brilliant, but |> just have lots of energy and enthusiasm.

I did read the original post. Again, please quote the whole reference, not just what supports your point. The list was extolling the "obviously higher technological accomplishments" of that group, with attendant veiled implication that others are not capable of these lofty achievements. I responded with errantly-aimed sarcasm, it would seem.

|> Which brings us to the obvious answer to the technical justification
|> for closed repeaters: If a bunch of bubba's with high school educations
|> in Ga can make a linked system with lots of features work well and
|> remain open, then why can't the closed repeater crowd?

I rather imgaine they could, but choose not to for whatever reasons they deem worthy. As the afore-mentioned babbas did.

|> The technical argument is invalid. Choose to be closed if you wish, but
|> do not expect sympathy based on technical excuses!

Please get off the dead horse of "damage". I expect little; therefore, I am not disappointed. Each side has its reasons. They act accordingly, with

a modicum of righteousness. The prosecution of such righteousness is the thing.

|>If you could/would read original posts as much as you refer to your
|> "Latin for Mindless Idiots" guide you would be much better off.
|> Is this required reading at Texas A&M?

I cannot help if someone misses completely the points I make. Such is the fallibility of Man. Besides, I am the judge of the degree of "better off", from my point of view. YOU would be "better off" going somewhere else to proselytize the brand of pap you espouse. IMNSHO, of course.

Now go away. To drag out another ism you will probably not like (or appreciate): "Never teach a pig to sing; It wastes your time, and annoys the pig."

Indeed. B-}

--
Kurt Freiberger, wb5bbw kurt@cs.tamu.edu 409/847-8607 fax:409/847-8578
Dept. of Computer Science, Texas A&M University DoD #264: BMW R80/7 pilot
"We preserve our freedom using three boxes: ballot, jury, and cartridge."
*** Not an official document of Texas A&M University ***

Date: 27 Jan 93 17:10:46 GMT
From: netcon!agood@locus.ucla.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <8527@lib.tmc.edu>, <1993Jan26.183209.9439@ke4zv.uucp>,
<8558@lib.tmc.edu>lroy.j
Subject : Re: Closed repeaters (FCC wants them open)

>>Well I always thought these closed systems were thinly disguised commercial
>>operations, now we know for sure. And from some of the access fees quoted
>>out of SoCal, apparently very profitable ventures as well. If you want to
>>operate machines for pay, Jay, then go into the commercial service where
>>you belong. Reread 97.113(b) before you flame. You can't *require* payment
>>for use of your radio station.

Right ON! I live in the Los Angeles area and the majority of repeaters are private closed systems where one may not even talk without paying a large fee.

I agree if one wants autopatch privledges beyond summoning the EMS one should contribute to the system, however this is not how it works in L.A. I have been quoted minimum fees of 150.00 per year for simple systems up to almost 1000.00 for the first year and 300.00 for the subsequent years.

Closed and private repeaters are a real disgrace IMHO because we in HAM radio tout ourselves as such public service minded individuals.

The 220 Mhz band, 440 Mhz band, and the 1200 Mhz band are virtually closed to the average HAm unless he or she is willing to shell out these MANDATORY contributions.

At my place of employment I set up a monitoring system to find a seldom used frequency in the 70 cm band for an open repeater. I used Karl Pagel's guide and chose frequencies where there were only one or possibly two systems listed. All of the systems monitored by myself over a two month period were inactive almost all day and night except for drive time to work and home. NONE of the fifteen frequencies monitored had more than a half dozen ham radio operators on them. IMHO these are private clubs tying up public resources for the benifit of a very few.

I think in the coming years the commercial industry is going to look at our innefficient use of spectrum and say, " Hey.. get these guys into a smaller allotment", just like 220 Mhz.

Sorry if I offended, but I'm sick of all of these private systems, quite a few of which ARE in fact making money.

>

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #24
